

CONFIDENTIAL

14 NOV 1983

13-1646

28
EXD-WG
BD 41

9 November 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Requirements and Technology
Acquisition Working Group

FROM: [redacted] Chairman

SUBJECT: Minutes of 3 November 1983 Working Group Meeting

1. The Requirements and Technology Acquisition Working Group met on
Thursday, 3 November 1983. Participants included [redacted]

[redacted] Monitoring the meeting were [redacted] (D/ODP) and
Bob Kohler (D/OD&E). [redacted]

2. [redacted] convened the meeting, asking for corrections to the
minutes of the 20 October meeting. [redacted] thought the minutes were too
brief on the subject of his comments on the Agency Contract Review Board
(ACRB), and on [redacted] suggestions about a requirements staff.
Bernie (not at this meeting) provided a written summary of his ideas (see
attachment). [redacted]

3. The group resumed its discussion on the idea of a requirements
group. [redacted] suggested that the primary issue was not who was part of
the group or where it resided, but what was its authority. [redacted]
thought a group staffed by users would make sense. Such a group would have
no voice in getting the requirements satisfied, however. [redacted]

4. [redacted] raised the issue of not enough requirements making it
through the system and being satisfied. The system doesn't treat small
requirements well, but there was a great deal of skepticism about imposing a
formal structure to solve this problem. [redacted] mentioned that ODP
was in the process of getting rid of the Form 930, a formal part of the
present requirements system. [redacted]

5. After some discussion on who sets policy in the Agency and why the
present requirements process seemed to be lacking, the group discussed the
idea of establishing an Information Systems Staff to support the ISB (an
idea being studied by the Information Services Planning Working Group).

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1 Bob Kohler described how OD&E handles requirements through its Configuration
Control Board. [redacted] (sitting in for [redacted]) questioned the
25X1 applicability (in detail) of that process for solving the Agency-level
25X1 problem. Bob Kohler responded that one could generalize the process to the
25X1 extent necessary. [redacted]

6. [redacted] criticized the group for not having a clear statement of
the problem before it. [redacted] will present such a statement at the
25X1 next meeting. He asked that each working group member jot down his view of
25X1 the most pressing problems of the existing requirements process. [redacted]

7. The next meeting of the working group is scheduled for Thursday, 17
November 1983, at 1030 in Room 4F31 Hqs. The agenda for that meeting, which
is scheduled for one hour, is as follows:

- a. Approval of minutes of the previous meeting.
- b. Miscellaneous old business.
- c. Discussion of requirements system problems.
- d. Discussion of needed requirements process changes. [redacted]

*D has
Comptroller
mtg
10:00-11:00
11:00-12:00
do 15B mtg*

25X1 O/Compt/IHG [redacted]

(9 Nov 83)

25X1 Attachment:
As stated

CONFIDENTIAL

4 November 1983

25X1

MEMORANDUM FOR: 

FROM:

SUBJECT: Correction to 20 Oct. WG Meeting Minutes

Paragraph six of the 20 October Requirements and Technology Acquisition Working Group meeting states my opinion as:

"...the ADP people in the Planning Staff and in the Comptroller's Office should provide whatever central coordination was required (to tie together the requirements process / budget process)."

Unfortunately, my recommendation was a bit more complex. The recommendation is as follows:

- communication and technical coordination of data processing requirements could be implemented as a staff function under the Director of Data Processing (as an extension to the Management Staff); this activity should be staffed by senior rotatees from the major consumers of data processing services; this activity's role would be to assess the benefits to be derived from a proposed requirement and to establish it's technical coherence with other proposed and ongoing activities.

- this, aforementioned, activity would be responsible, in support of or along with, the Office of the Comptroller, to present a coherent picture, to the EXCOM, of the costs (budget) and benefits of proposed data processing activities; options should be presented as cost/benefit analyses involve tradeoffs.

- perhaps the Planning Staff could provide overview of the process in order to assure and assess the quality of this staff support.

This is a better representation of what I said. It is more than a little disconcerting to see such a trivialization of the working group's (or at least one member of the working group's) efforts. It indicates to me that perhaps there is no justification for any active participation in the working group, or perhaps a need for improved performance or integrity, at least in the data recorded and presented.

25X1



ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY